



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/068,425	02/07/2002	Kentaroh Fukuda	JP920000431US1	9573

7590 08/14/2006

ANNE VACHON DOUGHERTY, ESQ.
3173 CEDAR ROAD
YORKTOWN HEIGHTS, NY 10598

EXAMINER

STORK, KYLE R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 08/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/068,425

Applicant(s)

FUKUDA ET AL.

Examiner

Kyle R. Stork

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 June 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-11 and 13-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,7-9,11 and 13-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5,6 and 10 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This final office action is in response to the amendment filed 7 June 2006.
2. Claims 1, 3-11, and 13-23 are pending. Claims 1 and 11 are independent claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 5-6 and 10 remain objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 7, 11, and 17 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bobrow et al. (US 2002/0029232, filed 14 November 1997, hereafter Bobrow), and further in view of Rivette et al. (US 6877137, filed 7 December 1999, hereafter Rivette).

As per independent claim 1, Bobrow discloses an information processing method comprising:

- Obtaining a plurality of page files from a web site (paragraph 0121)

- Generating a group of the page files, page layout structures or which are at least similar by analyzing the page files to introduce structural descriptive forms for the page layout structures and to assign characteristic values for the structural descriptive forms (Figure 15; paragraphs 0144-0147)
- Employing the structural descriptive forms and the characteristic values to calculate an inter-page distance representing a similarity of the page files (Figure 16)
- Grouping the page files, of which the inter-page distance is equal to or smaller than a predetermined value (Figure 15)

Bobrow fails to specifically disclose providing an annotation for an arbitrary page file in the group and correlating the first annotation with at least a part of other page files in the group. However, Rivette discloses providing an annotation for an arbitrary page file in the group and correlating the first annotation with at least a part of other page files in the group (column 4, line 59- column 5, line 34). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Rivette with Bobrow, since it would have allowed a user to annotate groups of related web pages with annotations (Rivette: column 5, lines 9-25).

As per dependent claim 7, Bobrow and Rivette disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Bobrow further discloses:

- Introducing a representative structural descriptive form that represents the groups and a representative characteristic value for the representative structural descriptive form (Figures 15-16; paragraphs 0144- 0142)
- Employing the representative structural descriptive form and the representative value to calculate an inter-group distance that delineates the similarity between the groups (Figure 15)
- Grouping the page files that are included in the groups, the inter-group distance of which is equal to or smaller than a predetermined value, and generating a common group (Figure 15)

Bobrow fails to specifically disclose providing an annotation for an arbitrary page file in the group and correlating the first annotation with at least a part of other page files in the group. However, Rivette discloses providing an annotation for an arbitrary page file in the group and correlating the first annotation with at least a part of other page files in the group (column 4, line 59- column 5, line 34). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Rivette with Bobrow, since it would have allowed a user to annotate groups of related web pages with annotations (Rivette: column 5, lines 9-25).

As per dependent claim 11, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 1. Claim 11 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 17, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 7. Claim 17 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 21, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 1. Claim 21 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 22, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 1. Claim 22 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 23, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 1. Claim 23 is similarly rejected.

6. Claims 3-4, 8-9, 13-14, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bobrow and Rivette, and further in view of Hori et al. ("Annotation-based Web Content Transcoding").

As per dependent claim 3, Bobrow and Rivette disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Bobrow does not specifically disclose wherein said structural descriptive forms are layout tags employing a style for designating a location on a page for representing tags that are correlated with said page layout structures included in said page files; and wherein said characteristic values are attributes of said layout tags and values of said attributes. However, Hori mentions that layout tags are used (Hori Page 2 Para 2 and 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply Hori to Camut, providing Camut the benefit of using HTML tags to determine the layout of each web page, which would assist the user in locating an annotation location.

As per dependent claim 4, Bobrow and Rivette disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Bobrow does not

specifically disclose wherein said inter-page distance is obtained by calculating a sum of the values obtained by weighting said characteristic value and said structural descriptive form that is included in common with said multiple page files. However, Hori mentions that calculations are made for determining the page files (Hori Page 6 Para 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply Hori to Camut, providing Camut the benefit of ensuring the calculations are right for determining the page files and annotation placement.

As per dependent claim 8, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 3. Claim 8 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 9, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 4. Claim 9 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 13, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 3. Claim 13 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 14, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 4. Claim 14 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 18, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 3. Claim 18 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 19, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 4. Claim 19 is similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 7 June 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that Bobrow fails teach assigning characteristic values for the structural descriptive forms (pages 18-19). However, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Bobrow teaches sorting information into meaningful groupings based upon a plurality of criteria (paragraphs 0146-0147). The information is then assigned to a group based upon that criteria (paragraphs 0146-0147).

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle R. Stork whose telephone number is (571) 272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kyle R Stork
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178

krs



**CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER**